Case 4:06-cv-02069-SBA Document 106 Filed 07/30/07 Page 1 of 5

1	LYNNE C. HERMLE (STATE BAR NO. 99779)							
2	lchermle@orrick.com MICHAEL A. APARICIO (STATE BAR NO. 206300)							
3	maparicio@orrick.com JESSICA R. PERRY (STATE BAR NO. 209321)							
4	jperry@orrick.com AMIRA B. DAY (STATE BAR NO. 239045)							
5	aday@orrick.com ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLI	P						
6	1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025							
7	Telephone: 650-614-7400 Facsimile: 650-614-7401							
8	Attorneys for Defendant WAL-MART STORES, INC.							
9	Arnold W. Schwartz (STATE BAR NO. 63436							
10	Marcus J. Bradley (STATE BAR NO. 174156) E-Mail: Marcus.Bradley@SchwartzDanielsBra							
11	SCHWARTZ, DANIELS & BRADLEY 29229 Canwood Street, Suite 208							
12	Agoura Hills, California 91301 Telephone: (310) 478-5838 or (818) 338-8900							
13	Facsimile: (310) 478-1232							
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs							
15								
16	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT						
17	NORTHERN DISTR	RICT OF CALIFORNIA						
18	OAKLAN	D DIVISION						
19								
20	In Re WAL-MART STORES, INC. WAGE AND HOUR LITIGATION	Case No. C 06-02069 SBA						
21		STIPULATION AND ORDER DISMISSING THIRD CLAIM FOR						
22	This Document Relates to:	RELIEF AND STRIKING RELATED ALLEGATIONS						
23	Case Nos.							
24	C 06-02069 SBA (Smith) and C 06-05411 SBA (Ballard)							
25	(=							
26		1						
27								
28								

1	STIPULATION					
2	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs' First Amended Consolidated Complaint sets forth, among					
3	other claims for relief on behalf of the putative class members, a claim for unpaid overtime in the					
4	third claim for relief.					
5	WHEREAS on May 29, 2007, the Court issued an Order granting in part and					
6	denying in part Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Strike the First Amended					
7	Consolidated Complaint;					
8	WHEREAS, in opposing Defendant's Motions with respect to the third claim for					
9	relief, Plaintiffs informed the Court that another case entitled Newland v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. is					
10	pending in the California Superior Court, County of Alameda, Case No. RG05193921;					
11	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have determined that the claims relating to alleged unpaid					
12	overtime in this action are substantially identical to the claims for unpaid overtime in the Newland					
13	action;					
14	WHEREAS the Newland action was commenced on January 14, 2005, over a year					
15	before the commencement of this action;					
16	WHEREAS Plaintiffs have determined that the Newland matter, which previously					
17	was stayed, is now moving forward and said stay has been lifted;					
18	WHEREAS Plaintiffs have determined that continuing to litigate the third claim					
19	for relief for overtime in this action may lead to unnecessary expense and waste of judicial					
20	resources;					
21	WHEREAS Plaintiffs in this matter wish to dismiss the entire third claim for relief					
22	and strike all allegations that relate solely to that claim;					
23	NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereby stipulate and agree and ask that the Court					
24	to approve this Stipulation as an Order of the Court:					
25	1. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a), to DISMISS the third					
26	claim for relief in its entirety;					
27	2. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f), to STRIKE the					
28	following language from the First Amended Consolidated Complaint, which by virtue of the					

dismissal of the third claim for relief is rendered impertinent:

\sim	
٠,	
1.	
_	

1

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Paragraph	Page	Line Start	Line End	Text
¶ 1	3	15	16	"(iii) current and former employees are owed overtime wages"
¶ 3	3	23	26	ENTIRE PARAGRAPH
¶ 6	4	11	-	"receiving pay for all overtime wages owed"
¶ 7	4	19	-	"(b) failed to pay for all overtime wages earned"
¶ 20	6	21	-	"overtime"
¶ 23	7	3	6	ENTIRE PARAGRAPH
¶ 27	7	21	26	"During Plaintiff Michael Wiggins' employment with Wal-Mart, Wal-Mart failed to pay overtime. Wal-Mart would 'shave off' time from his time cards whereby Mr. Wiggins was not paid for all of the hours he worked. Also, when Mr. Wiggins worked a graveyard shift, Wal-Mart would count the hours worked before midnight as working one day, and all the hours worked after midnight as hours worked on another day, thereby denying Mr. Wiggins overtime pay"
¶ 33	9	22	26	ENTIRE "Compensation Subclass" paragraph
¶ 37.5	11	11	13	ENTIRE PARAGRAPH
¶ 46	14	4	-	"overtime"
¶ 47	14	10		"overtime pay"
¶ 47	14	11	12	"and (3) Defendant altered Class and Sub-Class members overtime pay records thereby reducing the amount of

Case 4:06-cv-02069-SBA Document 106 Filed 07/30/07 Page 4 of 5

1 2					overtime pay due them."		
3	¶ 59-69	16-	-	-	ENTIRE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AND ALL		
4		18			PARAGRAPHS		
5	¶ 73	19	3	-	"510, and 1194 et seq."		
6	¶ 86	21	16	17	"the failure to pay all straight time and overtime		
7					compensation due to members of the proposed Class"		
8 9	¶ 89	22	15	-	"STRAIGHT TIME, OVERTIME"		
10	¶ 95	23	15	-	"overtime wages, wages for work off-the-clock, and"		
11	Prayer ¶ 2	24	4	-	"overtime"		
12		1	•	•			
13	Dated: July	3, 200	7		MARLIN & SALTZMAN SCHWARTZ, DANIELS & BRADLEY		
14					BAILEY PINNEY PC LAW OFFICES OF PETER M. HART		
15							
16					/s/		
17					Marcus J. Bradley Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
18							
19	Dated: July	3, 200	7		ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP		
20	, ,						
21					/s/		
22	Michael A. Aparicio Attorneys for Defendant WAL-MART STORES, INC.						
23					WAL-MART STORES, INC.		
24	///						
25	///						
26	///						
2728	///						
20					- 3 - STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER DISMISSING THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF C 06-02069 SBA

Case 4:06-cv-02069-SBA Document 106 Filed 07/30/07 Page 5 of 5

1	<u>ORDER</u>
2	Pursuant to Stipulation, it is so ordered.
	Fursuant to Supuration, it is so ordered.
3	Dated: July 30, 2007
4	
5	familie B. Ormshag
6 7	SAUNDRA B. ARMS TRONG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	